

January 17, 1995

reason to give other members of the body the prerogative of raising that particular issue. However, the rule can work both ways. It depends on what the body wants to do.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Suppose the bill is mine and I want to offer 30 amendments to my bill, nobody can raise the question as to whether or not I'm being dilatory, can they?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well if you want to kill your own bill, Senator Chambers, I suppose no one...most people wouldn't object to that most of the time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well suppose my aim is to kill time?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well there are better ways of killing time than that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It depends on how much the bill...

SENATOR BEUTLER: You're killing time on your own bill?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, it depends on how much the bill means to you, whether the bill means more than the taking of the time. Couldn't you force people to come to terms with you if you have a bill which is amenable to numerous amendments and you offer those amendments yourself to your bill and since there is no way to have a dilatory ruling made because the issue cannot be raised by anybody, the Speaker cannot just arbitrarily say well it looks to me like these amendments are going to take a long time so I'm going to take this off the agenda. That's not allowed so a certain amount of time is going to be taken.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mmm, hmm. If you think that would improve the bill, Senator Chambers, you're certainly welcome to add it. The objective of this particular amendment was, or this particular version of the rule change was to make a progressive kind of change. Certainly, the tactic that you're describing can be used now under the current rules.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And, Senator...

SENATOR BEUTLER: And if you wanted to indulge in that particular tactic, which for a number of reasons I think you would not, but in any event if you wanted to it would be possible under the new rule. So it doesn't, as we've said many